(XLIId Vol.) THE (No. 2017.)

MARYLAND GAZETTE.

THURSDAY, AUGUST 9, 1787.

ARISTIDES to PUBLICOLA.

SIR,

I SHALL, for as I can discover, the "paragraphical doctrine" of national instructions [illegible] yet been promulged in England. In the [illegible] thousands and thousands of books, continually issuing from the press, there may be [illegible] of the kind; but I never was so fortunate [illegible] Indeed, upon this doctrine alone [illegible] that in England, in [illegible] time might we not [illegible] of a national bankruptcy, followed by a revolution in their government? Borne down as the people are by the enormous taxes, laid for the purpose of discharging only the interest of their national debt, [illegible] can be little doubt that, with activity and perseverance, a majority of the electors might [illegible] to instruct their representatives to the amount of abolishing a great part of those taxes. "Reasoning [illegible] on the subject for the consideration of a free [illegible]." But although this doctrine of national instructions [illegible] unknown to the English, much has been said and written, on the [illegible] them, about instructions given by [illegible] to their representatives in a single borough, or to their representatives. Mr. Hume has [illegible] upon this subject, in which, however, he does not say that [illegible] instructions to [illegible] Hume, however, was well skilled in [illegible] and politics of that country; and was not [illegible] with the state of parties. He [illegible] the instructions of the different inhabitants [illegible] acknowledges that a representative might [illegible] the opinions of his [illegible] that he [illegible] ought to be entirely governed by their instructions. Now if Mr. Hume be not guilty of a great misrepresentation, [illegible] any person that can say, the general question [illegible] the operation of instructions is not frivolous.

The question between Publicola and Aristides is, simply and precisely, whether or not the decision of a majority of the people, or of the voters in a county, [illegible] so far as the circumstance of a law, is to [illegible] such members of the legislature as refuse to frame a bill agreeably to that direction. In maintaining the negative Aristides has called upon us, to shew, "who [illegible] the effects of, the probable [illegible] any government [illegible] exercise [illegible] the people in [illegible] the reasonableness of a law, to which the regular constitutional legislature was bound to give all the sanction of its authority." He further called upon me to produce even the opinion [illegible] fully approved [illegible] with a direction [illegible] the government, should [illegible] the legislature, and refuse it to pass the [illegible] To this, Publicola, you gave the following answer: "I refer you to the English government, the British government, the United Netherlands; and, on the authority of Mr. Sydney, I refer you to all the governments he enumerates on this subject, and which, at that time, admitted a representation of the people by delegation, viz. France, Spain, the states of Switzerland and Germany, the diets of Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Poland and Bohemia, and the [illegible] sent by the governments of the colonies, before the revolution, particularly the governments of Maryland." You further challenged me to produce [illegible] by Locke, who had challenged you to produce instances of governments, in which the right of instructions was acknowledged. You there seem disposed conveniently to confound national and particular instructions; to consider me as having denied, that the practice of giving any kind of instruction ever prevailed; and to claim the victory, in virtue of this [illegible]. Now Aristides never denied, that the practice of giving particular instructions prevailed in England, and in the English colonies. But he maintained, that instructions given by a particular county or borough, could operate, only as an opinion, a remonstrance, or advice. And this position he has fully established by Sydney and Hume; to say nothing of [illegible] Blackstone, Sir Edward Coke, and several others, whom in the course of the controversy I have quoted. I now call upon you to produce the [illegible] which shall prove, either good, bad, or indifferent, that a representative in England, should have contrary instructions from his constituents as borough, his vote [illegible] be conclusive, that such a bill should be [illegible], contrary to the instructions of a majority of counties and boroughs, in the house of commons, [illegible] the affirmative of the peers, and of the king, [illegible] ought not to be considered as [illegible] to [illegible]

Mr. Sydney informs you, that the deputies of the United Netherlands are subject to the instructions of their respective governments; and I have before told you, that the case of the United Netherlands is nothing to your purpose of establishing the doctrine of "*national instructions*" given by the people at large. Let us examine whether there is any thing relative to the other countries, mentioned in your reference, that will better answer your purpose.

France, ever since the dissolution of the Roman empire, has been under a king. It formerly consisted of twelve provinces, each of which had a parliament, composed of peers and landholders, whose consent was necessary to the passing of laws and the levying of money. It is now divided into many more provinces, whose parliaments still claim a kind of negative to the king's edicts, which always have been the law of the land. Will you be pleased to explain how the circumstances of France can make for your purpose? Languedoc and Brittany are provinces of France. Is either of them governed by laws dictated by the people at large? Has either of them a legislative body, which is bound to obey the instructions of the people at large?

The *cortes*, or courts of Spain, are, in point of form, somewhat similar to a British parliament. They consist of the nobility, the clergy, and the representatives of commons. But whatever their former privileges have been, these cortes now meet, only to confirm and record the decrees of the court. It is not impossible, that the representatives of commons were formerly somewhat on a footing with the English house of commons.

In Denmark, although it has always had a king, the legislative power was once in the nobility, the clergy, and the representatives of citizens and farmers. Ever since the year 1661, the king has been absolute, from the solemn act of the several orders, passed at that time. History does not inform us, that any one of those orders, on that momentous occasion, pursued the directions of the people. With respect to particular instructions from particular districts, it is probable enough, that such might have been formerly given, by way of commencing the opinion of the particular citizens and farmers.

In Sweden, Poland and Bohemia, the people have a share in the legislature, by representation. Whether or not the people in particular districts make a practice of instructing their respective representatives, or how far their representatives would hold themselves bound, I cannot positively say. But it is incumbent upon you to shew (if your reference is to answer any purpose) not only that representatives are there bound by the instructions of their electors; but that the whole legislature, or at least the whole representing body in the legislature, receive and invariably hold themselves bound to obey directions, given by a majority of the people. It would throw much light upon the subject, if you could shew likewise, in what manner the sense of the people, for the "*national instructions*," in those countries, is collected. I take it for granted, that the people, in those countries, were never more tenacious of their liberties and rights, than the people of England, whose rights Mr. Sydney asserts to be unimpaired. Now, admitting, that in all those countries, and even in England, the representatives of the people are considered as delegates without any right of deliberating in those cases, where their constituents choose to determine for themselves, you have not shewn, nor can it be shewn, that the people in those countries ever thought themselves entitled to dictate to the other branches of the legislature.

The diet of Germany consists of the emperor, of a great number of princes and great lords, who are absolute in their own states, and of the deputies of free cities. This diet is the supreme power which takes care of the interests of an immense confederacy. The princes and great lords speak for themselves. The deputies of cities pursue the instructions of the respective governments which they represent. For each of these cities has an internal government of its own. The diet then of Germany is nothing to your purpose; because in this diet there is no representation of the people at large.

But you refer me to all these governments, on the authority of Mr. Sydney. *Unfortunate Sydney! how hast thou been misrepresented and abused. But I trust that thou wilt lift down with complacency on him, who vindicates thy fame.* If Publicola will be pleased to examine attentively, he will find that, when Sydney speaks of deputies obliged to pursue the orders of those, who send them, he means the deputies of the states of the United Netherlands, or of the cantons in Switzerland, or of the free towns in Germany. It is true, he says the deputies of Castile, in the cortes held at Madrid, in the time of Charles the fifth, did excuse themselves from giving supplies, as Charles desired, because they had received no orders from the towns, which sent them. Sydney says likewise, that no grants of importance were ever made, without consulting their principals. He says too, that so long as the general assemblies of estates in France continued, the deputies acted in the same manner; and, when these general assemblies were laid aside, the same custom was used, in the assemblies of lesser estates in Languedoc and Brittanny. Now, Publicola, consider how far this authority operates in your favour. It amounts to no more than that certain deputies did not choose to grant the money of their constituents, before they were certain, it would be agreable to them. Is there any thing in Sydney, to prove the custom in Spain and France, of the peoples dictating laws even to their own representatives? Why, Sir, these very representatives seldom did more than consider the propositions, that came from the court. It would puzzle you, with all your reading, to discover one single instance, where a majority of the people at large, in either France or Spain determined, that this, or that law, should be passed, and so gave order to the whole representative body, that this body might propose it to the assembly of nobles, &c. and to the court. But, could you even do that, it would be insufficient, unless you could shew likewise, that the people dictated to all the branches.

That the question between us is determinable only upon a fair construction of our compact, is a position, I shall make a point of always repeating. I have however examined the question on every ground, and in every point of view. To a slight thinker, after all, the question may appear not very material. I shall ever contend, as strenuously as Publicola, that all rightful government originates from the people: that in every free government, there is a sacred compact, either express or implied; and that society and government were instituted solely for the good of the whole. I admit too, that whenever the legislature shall be possessed of the peoples sentiments and wishes they must in most cases, and indeed, in all cases, without some weighty reason to the contrary, do as the people would have them. Publicola seems to admit, that the people ought not to dictate, except on occasions of importance. Where then is the mighty difference between the doctrines of Publicola and Aristides? Why is not their contest about instructions as *frivolous*, as the contest in England? The difference consists in this. According to Publicola, if a majority of the people, or of the voters, shall at any time be prevailed on to subscribe instructions the business is as good as done. The legislature must pass a bill, agreeably to that direction. But Aristides maintains, that the legislature are at liberty to examine, whether these instructions, although signed by a majority really contain the general sense, and whether that general sense be right. There may be a variety of circumstances to render improper that measure, which appears salutary to the people, from the narrow view each individual has of the subject. It may be requisite too, in many cases, for the legislature immediately to adopt measures, contrary to instructions. According to Publicola, I should suppose, the utmost which the legislature could do, in such cases, after receiving "*national instructions*," would be to adjourn, and address the people, *to prevail on them to rescind those instructions.*

If Aristides be right, there will be little encouragement for a party at any time, to make a pretext of obtaining the peoples sense, in order to force upon the legislature, or upon a dissenting branch, a measure, which they have rejected, upon the maturest deliberation. If the thing had not actually occurred, it would hardly be believed, that any man of character could have the presumption to call another inimical to liberty, and ignorant of the peoples rights, merely for contending, that each branch of the legislature may exercise its own judgment, in passing, or rejecting bills.

On a dispassionate, and disinterested view, it is impossible to conceive, that the people having a right to dictate measures to the legislature, and to preclude its deliberation thereon, can operate as a security to liberty, or advance the true interests of the people. That the frequent exercise of such a right must tend to render of no avail the salutary institution of two distinct branches, and indeed to confer all power on a few men, can hardly be doubted. Your position is, that, if the right exists not, both branches "may turn their backs upon the complaints and grievances of the people; and, to obtain redress, the people must hazard a revolution and the halter." I have before, more than once sollicited your attention to the securities we enjoy against such deplorable corruption in our trustees. Should they *really* prove false to their trust, would not their influence shink you be exerted, to prevent instructions, or to defeat them, after they were given? *Where are the*

individuals who would dare to stand against the enjoyment and exercise of a corrupt senate and house of delegates united? If this unaccountable degeneracy, should prevail in each branch, and circumstances should render it unsafe to wait for the next period of election, would it not be better, at once, to resort to that grand remedy, prescribed by the 4th article of the declaration? But wherefore should you Publicola, by way of preventing a disorder, which you dread, use constantly a medicine, which is too apt of itself to produce worse diseases? There is little reason to believe, that the legislature or either branch will disregard those sufferings, of which they and their connexions cannot fail to participate. But admitting that instructions are binding; and admitting too, that they ought not to be given, except on important occasions; how apt will popular men be, whenever disappointed in a favourite measure, to tell the people it was of infinite importance, and that, by rejecting it, the legislature had turned their backs upon the people. Take now a passage from *your old* and *my new* acquaintance, Mr. Sydney —

"They may make prejudicial wars, ignominious "treaties, and unjust laws. Yet when the session is "ended, they must bear the burthen, as much as "others, and, when they die, the teeth of their "children will be set on edge with the sour grapes "they have eaten. But it is hard to delude, or "corrupt so many. Men do not, in matters of the "highest importance, yield to slight temptations. "No man serves the devil for nothing—small wages "will not content those who expose themselves "to perpetual infamy, and the hatred of a nation "for betraying their country."

Let us now quit for a while the theory of "national instructions," and consider the method of reducing it to practice. On a recent occasion, the mode adopted was nearly the same, as has heretofore been attempted, to bind individual representatives. In each county, were papers carried about among the people; and, if it had so happened, that a majority of voters in each of ten counties, had signed for an emission, those local instructions would have been held binding not only upon the *respective* representatives, but upon the whole house of delegates, and not only upon the house of delegates, but upon the senate likewise. Now the senate, although its members are not endowed with extraordinary privileges, as individuals, nor invested with their dignities for life, were intended, by the constitution, to be as independent in legislation, as the orders of nobility in the countries mentioned in your reference. The idea that senators are representatives of the people of Maryland, is no more just, than is the idea, that the king, and the house of lords, are representatives of the people of England. The notion too of senators being only deputies or trustees of the people, and therefore subject to their direction, *while they act as senators*, is just as well founded, as that of the king and house of lords being deputies and trustees, and therefore controlable by the people. You remember all which Locke says about deputies and trustees; and yet Locke does not place them on the same footing, as you would place *our* deputies and trustees.

You must, at least, allow, the method of conveying the national sense is no where prescribed. Who then has authority to declare *that*, about which the constitution and the laws are silent? The right of binding by "*national instruction*," you have told me is "*paramount*" to the constitution. The manner then of exercising this right perhaps ought to be fixed by the national voice. How is it, we find the manner adopted, without previously consulting the people. There is indeed an old law maxim, *omnis ratihabitio retrotrahitur et mandato equiparatur*. That is, according to this maxim, any man of competent zeal and assurance may assume an office belonging to no other. He may prepare a draught of instructions; and, if a majority shall sign them, it will be the same thing as, if the people had previously agreed on that mode. I will not perplex the case, by supposing a number of different draughts, carried about by different people. Suppose one of the self-created officers hands to the senate a paper, purporting to be instructions of a majority of voters in Anne-Arundel. The senate not being representatives of Anne-Arundel, may very probably be inclined to reject it. But then the senate is informed, that there are nine other papers, containing instructions from nine other counties; and that these, taken altogether, convey the national sense of Maryland. The senate thereupon determines to receive them all. However, these papers not being on the footing of sheriffs returns, the senate is not, on any principle, precluded from examining into their authenticity, the number of voters in each county, whether the names appearing belong to men residing, and having a right of suffrage in the respective counties, and whether these names were set down by the owners, or with their consents. Suppose, that, after a minute, laborious, expensive investigation, the senate finds one or more of the self-created officers guilty of a thousand frauds and forgeries. What then? Why then they may hold themselves not bound by those papers. Suppose a variety of forms, all tending nearly to the same point. The legislature must be perplexed in framing the law.

I have selected a few circumstances, to expose the lately adopted method of conveying the national sense, which was to lay the foundation of a law, and compel the senate to adopt that measure, which, without any imputation of corrupt views, they had before unanimously rejected. Let us now recur to the theory. Suppose the instructions of a majority of the people, prohibiting the passage of a particular bill depending in the assembly. The bill, notwithstanding, is passed in the usual form, and has all the sanctions, prescribed by the constitution. Will you maintain, that this act of assembly is unconstitutional and therefore no law; and that the executive and judicial ought to regard it as a mere *nullity*? Would you, in a court of justice, make the point, that it is no law? If you should, would you expect the court to make the inquiry, whether or not it was passed, contrary to the instructions of the people? In pursuance of your principle, I imagine you would. And, if your doctrine be right, the court ought, undoubtedly, to institute the inquiry. I would then demand "*by what authority*" they do this? Do they derive it from the constitution, or an act of assembly, or an adopted British statute, or the provision of the common law? The more we consider this "blessed doctrine" of instructions, signed by the people, controling and prescribing to each branch of the legislature, which notwithstanding, agreeably to our sacred compact, is to be at full liberty to exercise its own judgment; the more we shall be convinced, that, not being mentioned in this compact, nor in any preceding or subsequent law, the doctrine is altogether inadmissible upon any other ground.

There have been great occasions, on which, amongst a free people, the national voice has been *heard*. It has then constituted a law of the most exalted kind. The occasions I mean are, when the people have found it necessary, for the preservation of their rights, to interfere; and either make a total, or a partial, change in their government, or, under the old form, so place it in new hands. I need not remind you of the English revolution in 1688, or of the late astonishing revolution in America. Did any man, on occasions like these, ever think of going about with a paper, requiring and urging to subscribe, one after another, men who either knew nothing about the subject, or were totally indifferent what became of the paper after they were freed from his importunity? Did any man ever suppose that such a paper was to obtain a redress of all grievances? On the great occasions, just mentioned, and more particularly the last, the people acted from their own knowledge and feelings. They assembled together in every part of the country; and one opinion only, respecting the main question, prevailed. In cases like these, the national sense is collected without setting down names, and the national voice is always decisive. And, on occasions only of evident necessity like these, ought any man to solicit the national voice. I think, it may safely be affirmed, that never, before the late appeal, was it any where attempted, to procure the authority of the people at large, as a legal constitutional power, acting consistently with the other constitutional powers, to oblige the regular legislature to adopt a measure of mere domestic policy, concerning which a variety of opinions had indeed prevailed, but which, till very lately, had been approbated by all the best characters in the state. If history records any other instance, I doubt not, that, in the most decided manner, it censures the attempt. Never was it known that a determined attempt in the people at large, to exercise an authority, did not produce a convulsion, or a suspension, or a dissolution of the government. But I will not again tread over that ground.

When an adversary appears to me disposed to misconceive every thing I can say, I shall always take care to repeat and enforce my principal positions and arguments. Should the voice of the people, at any time, decidedly declare for an ordinary measure of policy, and no after circumstances should change the complexion of affairs, it will be prudent for the legislature, upon the principle of avoiding a greater evil, to submit. Should it plainly appear, that the national voice proceeds from delusion, and that obedience would be fatal to our interests, the legislature would be in such circumstances, as renders it most difficult to determine what ought to be done.

But should, at any time, the activity and perseverance of a party or set of men prevail so far, as by mere dint of persuasion, to obtain the signatures of a large majority of their fellow-citizens to instructions framed by themselves, I should hold those papers so far from laying the foundation of an indispensable act, that the legislature ought to make a determined point of withstanding an innovation, which might speedily overthrow the salutary institutions of the constitution. When there is not the least shadow of a provision in that constitution for conveying the sense of the people, so as to leave the legislature nothing more than the mere forms of reading a first and second time, passing, engrossing, &c. &c. when I say there is no provision made any where for this most important purpose, I am almost ashamed to have laboured so long, and against such an adversary, in disproving a doctrine, which I am sure must have appeared preposterous to almost every intelligent man, so soon as it was fairly stated. Your efforts, to rouse the public indignation against the man, whom you represent as endeavouring to break down the best guard to their liberty, can tend only to your own dishonour. It is impossible they should produce the intended effect, on any mind, that will attend to what is said on both sides, and to the whole conduct of each of the men. Would to Heaven! That every man of candour and intelligence, after taking the trouble of perusing our whole controversy, would openly declare, whether Publicola, by the [illegible] hath manifested a regard [illegible] superior to that of Aristides. Were [illegible] to be the doom of him against whom the "[illegible]" should declare, the [illegible] whom you idly affect to [illegible] would [illegible] calmness, *before the decision*, on his own account.

There is a plain and material difference between [illegible] laudable and [illegible] voluntarily and without provocation [illegible] fellow-citizens with discourses about himself and [illegible] afford—it is truly unmanly and disgusting. But when his reputation is wantonly attacked, they can [illegible] with patience, to hear him so long, as he confines himself to the charge, and [illegible] of modesty. However as I have some reason to [illegible] satisfied, that the public on no occasion [illegible] hear a man speak of himself, I shall conclude, [illegible] out doing that, which, at first, I intended. My [illegible] ments on the proceedings relative to the action of [illegible] late publication shall hereafter appear, provided [illegible] shall be convinced that they are necessary, or that [illegible] the public wishes to see them.

Annapolis, August 2, 1787. ARISTIDES.

[illegible] MARYLAND GAZETTE.

EVERY appearance of the pestilential disorder with which the inhabitants of this city [illegible] been so much afflicted, is entirely gone; in consequence of which the Jews, and other families have returned, and trade is restored to its [illegible] channel. An agent from the United States of America, and another from the court of Petersburg have arrived, and established factories which [illegible] to be very successful, especially as each is [illegible] to gain the most powerful protection and recommendation of government.

LONDON, [illegible]

His majesty the king of Sardinia has given [illegible] to all foreign consuls resident in his dominions, [illegible] an inexhaustable mine of the finest and [illegible] table salt has been lately discovered [illegible] tain called Aloita, about two miles from the [illegible] Cagliari, the capital of Sardinia. That [illegible] able number of men are now employed in [illegible] the salt, which is naturally so, pure, as to render [illegible] expence of refining. That when sufficient [illegible] dity shall be prepared, public notice will be [illegible] the different nations of Europe, who may reap [illegible] vantages from becoming their raw material [illegible] manufactures which will be taken [illegible] —His majesty for the encouragement of foreign [illegible] promises no more duty on exportation [illegible] acted than five sous per ton, for the term of [illegible] year.

By an advertisement in the Amsterdam Gazette of the 10th inst. we are informed, that an [illegible] and philosophic physician residing in that city [illegible] Mr. Dellier, has lately applied inflammable air to [illegible] species of amusement very different from any [illegible] hitherto attempted. After an assiduous application [illegible] for several years to the subject, he has constructed [illegible] machine with which he represents various figures [illegible] and devices by means of the electric fluid. This [illegible] chine is thirteen feet in length and of similar height [illegible] three reservoirs properly adapted thereto, contain [illegible] the inflammable air, and the 900 different pieces [illegible] joined one to another, have such a particular [illegible] tion and effect. The exhibitions produced by [illegible] curious and wonderful power of mechanism [illegible] most resemble those contrived with gunpowder [illegible] fiery things, &c. but much superior in brilliancy [illegible] without smell or smoke. And the fire assumes [illegible] ous tints, at the will of the mechanist.

NEW-YORK, July 24.

Extract of a letter from a gentleman in [illegible]

"The back country people have lately settled [illegible] Indians, and a party under the command of [illegible] Alexander, consisting of 200 men, is gone out [illegible] that a general war is thought to be inevitable. [illegible] number of the Creek nation have within this [illegible] past been stolen in and near Augusta, [illegible] negroes; some more lives were also lost [illegible] their escape, and gave the alarm. One Proctor [illegible] taken up on suspicion of being concerned with [illegible] thieves, who are supposed to have made [illegible] the Indian nation. A party is out after them, [illegible] are in hopes to overtake them."

CHARLESTON, July 13.

Extract of a letter from Savannah, dated July 6.

"It may be relied on for a fact, that there will [illegible] no Creek war, for they have shut down a fine [illegible] talk to our governor at Augusta, about five days [illegible] go. The origin of the dispute, which it was thought [illegible] would drive the Creek nation to war, arose from [illegible] circumstance of a young Indian, hanging himself [illegible] who was held in confinement as an hostage at [illegible] gusta last April. His relations could never be [illegible] to believe but that he was murdered—they determined on retaliation, and accordingly they killed [illegible] white men, and scalped them. A party of [illegible] went immediately in pursuit, fell in with a [illegible] party of Indians, but not the aggressors, and killed [illegible] of them. Things stood thus open for a general [illegible] rupture. The Indians acted with great [illegible] propriety on the occasion—they sent an [illegible] who explained and lamented the mistake that [illegible] posed, and which had nearly set the [illegible] on fire. [illegible] as it has been unhappily [illegible] they will [illegible]

[illegible] ... [illegible] ... [illegible] ... [

July 22, 1787.

ON the petition of Thomas Woodward, of Baltimore county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioner, that the twenty-first day of September next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors, at the chancery office in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees, will be appointed on that day, on their behalf, according to the direction of the said act; and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal, and Baltimore Advertiser,

Test. 2 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

July 23, 1787.

ON the petition of George Sibbald, of Prince George's county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioner, that the tenth day of September next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors, at the chancery office in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day, on their behalf, according to the direction of the said act; and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal, and Baltimore Advertiser, and in the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 2 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

July 28, 1787.

ON the petition of Nicholas Serlott, a prisoner in Charles county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioner, that the 24th day of September is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors, at the chancery office, in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day on their behalf, according to the direction of the said act; and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 2 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

July 31, 1787.

ON the petition of Samuel Purviance, of Baltimore county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given, to the creditors of the said petitioner that the 25th day of September next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors at the chancery office, in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day, on their behalf, according to the direction of the said act, and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, and in the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 2 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

July 31, 1787.

ON the petition of Samuel Purviance and Robert Purviance, of Baltimore county, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioners, that the 25th day of September next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors, at the chancery-office in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day, according to the direction of the said act, and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, and in the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 2 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD. Reg. Cur. Can.

July 24, 1787.

ON the petition of Charles Phillipshill, a prisoner in Worcester county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioner, that the fourteenth day of September next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors at the chancery-office, in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day on their behalf, according to the directions of the said act; and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, and in the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 3 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

July 18, 1787.

ON the petition of Josiah Blakely and Joseph West, of Baltimore county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioners, that the fifth day of September next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors, at the chancery office, in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day, according to the direction of the said act, and it is ordered, that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, and Maryland Gazette, and personally served on the attorney-general, and on the treasurer of the Western Shore.

Test. 4 SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

Leonard-town, Saint Mary's county, July 14, 1787.

THIS is to give notice, that the subscriber intends to petition the next county court, to take the benefit of an act lately passed, for the relief of insolvent debtors.

3 6w ROGER CLARKE.

July 7, 1787.

ON the petition of John Lamb, late a prisoner in Calvert county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioner, that the 20th day of August next is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors at the chancery office in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day, on their behalf, according to the direction of the said act, and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal and Baltimore Advertiser, and the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 6X SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

July 18, 1787.

ON the petition of Samuel Sprigg, a prisoner in Montgomery county, to the chancellor, praying the benefit of the act of assembly, entitled, An act respecting insolvent debtors, notice is hereby given to the creditors of the said petitioner, that the sixth day of September next, is appointed for a meeting of the said creditors, at the chancery office in the city of Annapolis, and that a trustee or trustees will be appointed on that day on their behalf, according to the direction of the said act; and it is ordered that this notice be published six weeks in the Maryland Journal, and Baltimore Advertiser, and in the Maryland Gazette.

Test. 6X SAMUEL HARVEY HOWARD, Reg. Cur. Can.

June 29, 1787.

LANDS FOR SALE.

NOTICE is hereby given, that by virtue of an act of the last session of assembly, entitled, An act to empower Sarah Buchanan, executrix of Archibald Buchanan, deceased, Alexander Cowen, Thomas Sim Lee, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, and Benjamin Nicholson, to sell and dispose of certain tracts of land, for the purpose herein after mentioned, the subscribers will sell at Timonium, the dwelling plantation of Sarah Buchanan, on the 20 day of september next, for bonds or settlement certificates, for the purpose of discharging sundry judgments obtained by the state of Maryland against the heir at law of the said Archibald Buchanan, deceased, the following tracts of land, lying and being in Baltimore county, on the great road that leads from Baltimore-town to York-town, and is eleven miles from the former, called Taylor's Palace, Welch's Fancy, and Robinson's Addition, three tracts adjoining, and containing 240 acres, fifty of which are already in excellent meadow, and fifty more may be made with a small expence, with a fine stream of water running through the whole, which is sufficient to water every four of it. Also, four other tracts, lying near the aforementioned lands, each adjoining, called Jack's Double Purchase, and Part of Jack's Double Purchase, Part of Sulled and Strife; upwards of thirty acres in meadow, and more may be made with very little expence, containing in the four tracts 350 acres; the most part of these lands are bottom, and remarkable for its fertility in producing all kinds of grain; three or four elegant situations for country seats that commands a most beautiful and extensive inland prospect, the whole well watered, and is part of that well known and valuable estate, formerly called Belleneid.—One third of the purchase money to be paid the 20th day of September next, another third the 20th day of March next, and the remaining third the 20th day of September, in the year, 1788.

SARAH BUCHANAN, Executrix.
THOMAS SIM LEE,
DAN. of St. Tho. JENIFER,
ALEXANDER COWEN,
BENJAMIN NICHOLSON.

5 At the same time, and place will be offered for sale, a variety of useful and elegant household furniture, for cash or final settlements.

SARAH BUCHANAN.

State of Maryland, Talbot county, June 25, 1787.

AGREEABLE to an act of the general assembly of this state, entitled, An act to erect a town in Talbot county, will be exposed to sale, (and will continue by adjournment until the whole are sold) on Tuesday the 21st day of August next, on the premises, Several lots of ground, situate, lying and being within the limits of the aforesaid town, on the following terms.—The purchaser to give bond with sufficient security, to be approved of by the commissioners for laying out the said town, or a major part of them, to pay the purchase money with interest thereon, in twelve months to the proprietor of the land, except the just proportion of the expences of surveying, laying out, clearing and bounding the said town, which must be paid in ready money, and no person to possess more than three lots within twelve months after the same are divided, platted and laid out.

6w JEREMIAH BANNING,
HUGH SHERWOOD, of Huntington,
JOHN STEVENS,
GREENBURY GOLDSBOROUGH,
ALEXANDER M'CALLUM,
Commissioners appointed by law for laying out and selling the said ground.

6X

July 6, 1787.

A VALUABLE LOT for SALE.

On Wednesday the 15th day of August next will be exposed to sale, at the house of Mr. Cornelius Mills,

A LOT of ground in the city of Annapolis, pleasantly situated near the town-gate, on the south side of the street. The purchaser to give bond and security, to pay the money in three equal annual payments with interest.

AMELIA WEEMS.

5X

June 29, 1787.

LANDS FOR SALE.

NOTICE is hereby given, that by virtue of an act of the last session of assembly, entitled, An act to empower Sarah Buchanan, executrix of Archibald Buchanan, deceased, Alexander Cowen, Thomas Sim Lee, Daniel of St. Thomas Jenifer, and Benjamin Nicholson, to sell and dispose of certain tracts of land, for the purpose herein after mentioned, the subscribers will sell at Timonium, the dwelling plantation of Sarah Buchanan, on the 20 day of september next, for bonds or settlement certificates, for the purpose of discharging sundry judgments obtained by the state of Maryland against the heir at law of the said Archibald Buchanan, deceased, the following tracts of land, lying and being in Baltimore county, on the great road that leads from Baltimore-town to York-town, and is eleven miles from the former, called Taylor's Palace, Welch's Fancy, and Robinson's Addition, three tracts adjoining, and containing 240 acres, fifty of which are already in excellent meadow, and fifty more may be made with a small expence, with a fine stream of water running through the whole, which is sufficient to water every four of it. Also, four other tracts, lying near the aforementioned lands, each adjoining, called Jack's Double Purchase, and Part of Jack's Double Purchase, Part of Sulled and Strife; upwards of thirty acres in meadow, and more may be made with very little expence, containing in the four tracts 350 acres; the most part of these lands are bottom, and remarkable for its fertility in producing all kinds of grain; three or four elegant situations for country seats that commands a most beautiful and extensive inland prospect, the whole well watered, and is part of that well known and valuable estate, formerly called Belleneid.—One third of the purchase money to be paid the 20th day of September next, another third the 20th day of March next, and the remaining third the 20th day of September, in the year, 1788.

SARAH BUCHANAN, Executrix.
THOMAS SIM LEE,
DAN. of St. Tho. JENIFER,
ALEXANDER COWEN,
BENJAMIN NICHOLSON.

5 At the same time, and place will be offered for sale, a variety of useful and elegant household furniture, for cash or final settlements.

SARAH BUCHANAN.

[illegible] Calvert county, [illegible]

On Saturday the 25th day of August will be SOLD, at the late dwelling plantation of Mr. [illegible] deceased, [illegible] SUNDRY valuable negroes, men, women and boys and girls.—Also [illegible] together with [illegible] The purchasers will also discover [illegible] credit) one hundred acres of wood land, [illegible] negroes, and several valuable [illegible]

CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

ANNAPOLIS RACES.

OCTOBER MEETING.

THE JOCKEY CLUB PURSE OF FOUR HUNDRED GUINEAS, will be run for on [illegible] Thursday, the 18th of October, [illegible] terms. The horses to [illegible] The stewards of the Club and [illegible] under the necessity of calling upon [illegible] are in arrears, to pay up their [illegible] ensuing races, otherwise they [illegible] names published, agreeably to a resolution [illegible] October last.

The secretary will attend, the evening preceding the race, at Mr. Mann's, to receive [illegible] the present year, which he hopes will be [illegible] guineas to save trouble.

N. B. The Club will meet, the day of the race, at Mann's, at one o'clock.

Will be SOLD, [illegible] Monday the 20th day of August, [illegible] John B. Beanes's farm in Prince-George's county, [illegible] The house and lot in Piscataway town, where [illegible] now lives. [illegible] of improved ground [illegible] adjoining the said town. The [illegible] years occupied as a tavern, and is [illegible] stand. [illegible] Twelve months credit will be given [illegible] giving bond and security approved [illegible] the purchase sum or any part thereof [illegible] sale within one month, a discount [illegible] cent. will be allowed.

BENJAMIN BERRY.

On Saturday the 25th day of August will be SOLD, at the late dwelling plantation of Mr. [illegible] deceased, [illegible] SUNDRY valuable negroes, men, women and boys and girls.—Also [illegible] together with [illegible] The purchasers will also discover [illegible] credit) one hundred acres of wood land, [illegible] negroes, and several valuable [illegible]

CHARLES WILLIAMSON.

Final Settlement Bonds for Sale.

ANY gentleman that wants [illegible] purchase Final Settlement [illegible] any kind, may be supplied on [illegible] able terms. Credit will be given [illegible] approved security. Letters [illegible] to the subscriber, at Philadelphia, [illegible] be duly attended to.

5 HUGH PATTON.

EIGHT DOLLARS REWARD.

BROKE out [illegible] Maryland, [illegible] him; he is [illegible] blacksmithing [illegible] he was [illegible] ever will take [illegible] again, shall receive the above reward.

DAVID STUART.

5

ANNAPOLIS: Printed by F. and S. GREEN, at the POST-OFFICE, Francis-Street.